

Claim 1 which is generic to all species. Claim 1 calls for eyewear comprising a first and a second lens, a half-jacket frame adapted to receive both lenses and a removable shield for reducing direct impingement of moving unfiltered air and dust. With reference to Claim 13, the fact that Claim 13 identifies an additional element such as a the nose contacting element attached on the half jacket frame front does not exclude Claim 1 which is generic thereto. Claim 13 could just as easily have been written as --Eyewear as set forth in Claim 1 wherein the half jacket frame front has a nose contacting element--. Likewise, Claim 20 could have been written directly dependent from Claim 1 but claiming the lens retaining grooves in that frame front.

Claim 26 likewise falls into this category.

The only possible bases for a proper election requirement are those claims directed to the method of protecting the eyes of a motorcycle rider in Claims 27-28.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of the restriction requirement is requested with respect to all claims, with the exception of Claims 27 and 28, as Claim 1 is generic to Claims 2-26 and 29-30.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant believes the restriction/election requirement is improper and all claims should be examined in a single application.

Respectfully,

MILES & STOCKBRIDGE, P.C.

By: 

Edward J. Kondracki
Reg. No. 20,604

1751 Pinnacle Drive, Suite 500
McLean, Virginia 22102-3833
Telephone: (703) 610-8627
#9258596v1